

From: "Szebeni, Marton" <mszebeni@seroscience.com>
To: wtc@nist.gov
Subject: comment

Dear Dr. Snyam Sunderl

I would like to comment on your statement with regard to the WTC7 investigation, in which you stated, referring to the alternative hypotheses of controlled demolition that you found some hypotheses so unrealistic that you did not even investigate the possibility of their occurrence.

Could you explain to me, or the public, why the possibility of controlled demolition by high-tech thermite is unrealistic?

Since I and many other people across the world do not see it that way. You need to state scientifically why you ruled this possibility out.

You also stated repeatedly, that your mission was not to convince skeptics, but to find out what caused the collapse.

If you truly believe this, please act accordingly. Ignoring evidence that does not support your preconceptions is not science, and by doing this you are not acting according to your stated mission.

For example, you stated that if there had been a controlled demolition a loud boom would have been heard, which was not heard, therefore there was no controlled demolition.

To me, this little kid's argument is unacceptable.

As far as I know methods exist for destroying steel without having a loud explosion produced. If you also know this to be true, than why present this little kid's argument? If thermite is not a viable possibility than please, provide evidence that it was not, or could not have been used.

You also need to address the videos on the internet that do in fact show a loud boom from building 7, and ones that show firefighters saying the building is coming down, along with other eyewitness testimony and evidence of foreknowledge that you ignore. Please provide proof that no loud explosion was heard from the building.

As a scientist, you can't make such a statement without providing proof of it.

You also need to release the models and evidence that you used in your report for scrutiny by the public.

If your models are indeed correct, you should not be afraid to make them available for independent analysis.

Personally I find you not credible, argument made by scientists in the 9/11 truth movement are to me much more credible.

Marton Szebeni